# IGT Transportation Charges Invoice Template Document

An ancillary document to the IGT UNC

Version 1.3

# Contents

| Change History  | . 2 |
|---|-----|
| Document Overview   | . 3 |
| IGT Transportation Charges Invoice Backing Data Format and Completion Rules |     |

# **Change History**

| Version | Change                       | Date          |
|---------|------------------------------|---------------|
| 0.1     | Draft                        | April 2013    |
| 0.2     | Inclusion of Smart Data      | April 2013    |
| 1.0     | IGT UNC Implementation       | June 2013     |
| 1.1     | Align with IGT039 and IGT076 | June 2017     |
| 1.2     | Changes for IGT102           | November 2018 |
| 1.3     | Draft for Mod IGT112         | [June2019]    |

## **Document Overview**

This ancillary document was created by Modification Proposal IGT043VV which was raised to consolidate and standardise the Gas Transportation invoices whilst improving the transparency of the charge items.

IGT112V further evolved this document to make it generic to cover both legacy and Relative Price Control (RPC) charges, the charge types were already introduced as part of IGT043VV but the business rules did not allow for them. RPC is a mechanism overseen by the Authority which requires IGT charges to be capped for all new customers at a level broadly consistent with the GDN equivalent charge. The use of RPC is set out in Special Condition 1 of the Independent Gas Transporters' Licences.

The document covers these broad areas:

- Legacy charge types (B10)
- RPC charge types (B12)
- Adjustment charge types (B11 for legacy and B13 for RPC)
- Contingency invoice charge types (B14 for contingency charge and B15 for contingency adjustment)

Any formatting or compliance issues identified relating to the IGT Transportation Charges Invoice Template should be notified to the Pipeline Operator by the Pipeline User using the Standards of Service process.

If a Pipeline Operator invoice contact is required the Pipeline User can liaise with the IGT UNC Secretariat or the Pipeline Operator directly to obtain the information.

### NOTES:

## Note 1:

Throughout the record / field descriptions, the Pipeline Operator will be referred to as the IGT.

## Note 2:

Data completion for the record / fields within the IGT Transportation Charges Invoice Template will utilise the following values only:

OPT - Mandatory/Conditional/Optional (M - Mandatory, C - Conditional O - Optional)

DOM - Domain (T - Text, N - Numeric, D - Date (YYYYMMDD))

LNG - Number of characters

DEC - Number of decimal places

### Note 3:

All text fields will be enclosed in double quotes ("") in a comma separated value (CSV) format).

### Note 4:

The IGT Transportation Invoice Charges Template will utilise the following hierarchy:

| Level | Record Name          | Occurrence    | Optionality |
|-------|----------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1     | T01_IGT_INV_HEADER   | 1             | М           |
| 1     | B1X*_IGT_CHARGE_TYPE | Up to 1000000 | М           |
| 1     | Z99_IGT_INV_TRAILER  | 1             | М           |

<sup>\*</sup>B1X relates to the individual charge types outlined in CHARGE\_TYPE

### Note 5:

Each Invoice Document will have only one IGT Transportation Invoice Charges Template file submitted to support it.

### Note 6:

Where the RPC methodology applies all RPC records / fields which have been categorised with optionality of C - Conditional become M - Mandatory and must be completed.

# IGT Transportation Charges Invoice Backing Data Format and Completion Rules

# T01\_IGT\_INV\_HEADER

| RECORD/FIELD NAME | ОРТ | DOM | LNG | DEC | DESCRIPTION  | Technical WG<br>Discussion Points                              | Technical WG Meeting Recommendations  |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| TRANSACTION_TYPE  | М   | Т   | 3   | 0   | Populate with the a code identifying the type of request that this record represents VALUE: T01  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? | It will work as drafted               |
| IGT_ID            | М   | Т   | 3   | 0   | Populate with the reference which uniquely identifies an IGT, as defined within the Supply Point Adminiatrative Agreement (SPAA) Market Domain Data (MDD)        | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? | It will work as drafted               |
| SHIPPER_ID        | М   | Т   | 3   | 0   | Populate with a reference which uniquely identifies a Pipeline User, as defined within the Supply Point Adminiatrative Agreement (SPAA) Market Domain Data (MDD) | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? | It will work as drafted               |
| CREATION_DATE     | М   | D   | 8   | 0   | Populate with date format YYYYMMDD   | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? | It will work – but recommend YYYYMMDD |
| INVOICE_NUMBER    | М   | Т   | 20  | 0   | Populate with a unique number by which the Invoice Document can be identified  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? | It will work as drafted               |

Example: "T01","TTT","TTT",YYYYMMDD,"TTTTTTTTTTTTTTT"

# **B1X\*\_IGT\_CHARGE\_TYPE**

\*B1X relates to the individual Charge Types outlined in CHARGE\_TYPE

| RECORD/FIELD NAME | ОРТ | DOM | LNG | DEC | DESCRIPTION | Technical WG Discussion Points | Technical WG Meeting Recommendations |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | Should the header              | Yes, separate it out and remove      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | section be                     | this row                             |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | introduced and does            |                                      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | the proposed                   |                                      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | section deliver                |                                      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | accurately?                    |                                      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | Should the footer              | Yes, separate it out and remove      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | section be                     | this row                             |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | introduced and does            |                                      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | the proposed                   |                                      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | section deliver                |                                      |
|                   |     |     |     |     |             | accurately?                    |                                      |

| CHARGE TYPE               | м | Т | 3  | 0 | Populate with the allowable value which relates to the Supply Meter Points charging methodology or the relevant contingency/adjustment allowable value:  B10 – Legacy charge B11 – Legacy adjustment. B12 – RPC charge B13 – RPC adjustment B14 – Contingency charge B15 – Contingency adjustment  Where the B14 or B15 CHARGE_TYPE has been populated, the GENERAL_INFORMATION field must also be populated. | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? The wording has been taken from IGT102 — implementation of Nov 2018 rather than the current RPC document. | It will work as drafted  |
|---------------------------|---|---|----|---|---|--|--|
| IGT_PROJECT_REFERENCE     |   | Т | 20 | 0 | Populate with a unique reference allocated by the IGT which identifies the CSEP project.  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Does the group agree it aligns with the UK Link requirements?   | It will work as drafted  |
| METER_POINT_REFERENCE     | М | N | 10 | 0 | Populate with a unique identifier for the point at which a meter is, has been or will be connected to the gas network.  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required?   | Aligned to CDSP field name and description   |
| START DATE                | М | D | 8  | 0 | Populate with date format YYYYMMDD. For B10, B12 or B14 it is the start date of the charges within a Billing Period. For B11, B13 or B15 it is the start date of the adjustment period.   | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Is Billing Period the best defined term to use?   | Added in B14 and B15 into the text – happy this will work Charged format to YYYYMMDD |
| END DATE                  | М | D | 8  | 0 | Populate with date format YYYYMMDD. For B10, B12 or B14 it is the end date of the charges within a Billing Period. For B11, B13 or B15 it is the end date of the adjustment period.   | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Is Billing Period the best defined term to use?   | Added in B14 and B15 into the text – happy this will work Charged format to YYYYMMDD |
| BILLING_DAYS              | М | N | 3  | 0 | Populate with the number of billing days. For B10, B12 or B14, it is the period in line with the START_DATE and END_DATE for the Billing Period. For B11, B13 or B15 it is the total for the adjustment period between the START_DATE and END_DATE for the Billing Period.  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Is Billing Period the best defined term to use?   | Added in B15 into the text – happy this will work                                    |
| CSEP_EXIT_ZONE_IDENTIFIER | М | T | 3  | 0 | Populate with a unique reference for the Exit Zone associated with the Connection System Exit Point (CSEP) to the larger GT network.  | Should this be one or the other? Does the group have a preference?   | Aligned to CDSP field name and description   |
| PROPERTY TYPE             | М | Т | 3  | 0 | Where the Supply Meter Point is Domestic populate using the NExA table values.  | Does the proposed wording clearly  | Adding in INF – for infill   |

|                      |   |   |    |   | Where the Supply Meter Point is Non-Domestic populate as "COM".   | articulate what is   | DCV is for caravans and it would   |
|----------------------|---|---|----|---|---|--|--|
|                      |   |   |    |   | Where the Supply Meter Point is infill populate with "INF".   | required? Is Commercial Supply Point the correct term?   | be better mapped to 1BP – not added.   |
|                      |   |   |    |   |   | What about INF and DCV which are also allowable data items?  |  |
| RPC_ENTRY_POINT_DATE | С | D | 8  | 0 | Populate with date format YYYYMMDD. Populate with the date it entered the RPC regime. Where it is legacy leave as null/blank.   | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Should this be connection date or a defined term?                           | Making Conditional to accommodate legacy and updated description. Charged format to YYYYMMDD                       |
|                      |   |   |    |   | Populate with the acronym for the makeup of an End User Category (EUC). EUC's categorise end users in terms of their LDZ, AQ lower limit, AQ upper limit, meter read frequency, BGIC code, winter start, and end month and the ratio of upper and lower limit.  For example: EUC01B | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Does there need to be a WAR band example? Does the naming align to the CDSP | Aligned to CDSP field name and description   |
| EUC_DESCRIPTION      | М | Т | 12 | 0 | Populate where it has entered the RPC regime  | naming?  Does the proposed   | Making Conditional to  |
|                      |   |   |    |   | with the AQ in accordance with NExA table at time of RPC entry.  Where it is legacy leave as null/blank.  | wording clearly articulate what is required? Is there a common CDSP term to use other than the   | accommodate legacy and updated description.  |
| RPC_ENTRY_POINT AQ   | С | N | 12 | 0 |   | name?  |  |
| RPC_ENTRY_POINT_SOQ  | С | N | 10 | 0 | Populate where it has entered the RPC regime with the SOQ derived from CSEP NExA AQ at time of RPC entry.  Where it is legacy leave as null/blank.  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Is there a common CDSP term to use other than the suggested item name?      | Making Conditional to accommodate legacy and updated description.  |
| IGT BILLING AQ       | М | N | 12 | 0 | Where Class 1 and Class 2 Supply Meter Points the SMP AQ is populated. Where Class 3 and Class 4 Supply Meter Points the Formula Year AQ is populated.  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Does the naming align to the common CDSP naming                             | **suggestion based on TWG<br>discussions**<br>Original Meter Point AQ given to<br>the CDSP – it is held in UK Link |
| 101_5122.110_//\d    |   | 1 | 12 | 0 | Populate with the unique identifier for the   | Does the proposed  | Aligned to CDSP field name and   |
| CSEP_ID              | М | Т | 8  | 0 | Connected System Exit Point (CSEP) - as nominated by the CDSP.  | wording clearly  | description  |

|                        | - |   |    |   | - |  |  |   |
|------------------------|---|---|----|---|---|--|--|---|
|                        |   |   |    |   |   |  | articulate what is required? Does this naming align to the common CDSP naming?   |   |
| CSEP_NOMINATED_AQ      | М | N | 12 | 0 |   | Populate with the Maximum AQ Value held by the CDSP taking into account the aggregated sum of all nested CSEPs.  If IGT is Nesting – value is 0.  If IGT is Lead – aggregated AQ Value.  If no nest exists – value is IGT CSEP Maximum AQ in kWh.                                | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Does this naming align to the common CDSP naming?                   | Leaving as proposed – it isn't currently used by most and will likely be a duplicate of CSEP_CONNECTION_MAX_AQ  |
| CSEP CONNECTION MAX AQ | М | N | 12 | 0 |   | Populate with the total projected maximum annual offtake (AQ) of gas (measured in kWh) of all Supply Meter Points associated with this CSEP's connection to the upstream network.  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Does this naming align to the common CDSP naming?                   | It'll work – leave as drafted   |
|                        | M | N | 12 | 0 |   | Populate the total projected maximum annual offtake (AQ) of gas (measured in kWh) of all Supply Meter Points associated with this connected system.  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Does this naming align to the common CDSP naming?                   | It'll work – leave as drafted   |
|                        | М | N | 12 | 0 |   | Populate with the total projected supply offtake quantity (SOQ) of gas (measured in kWh) of all Supply Meter Points associated with this connected system.   | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required? Does this naming align to the common CDSP naming?                   | It'll work – leave as drafted   |
| METER_SERIAL_NUMBER    | С | Т | 14 | 0 |   | Populate with the manufacturers meter serial number where the IGT is the Gas Act Owner or where the meter serial number is known.  | Does the proposed<br>wording clearly<br>articulate what is<br>required?<br>Does this naming<br>align to the common<br>CDSP naming? | CDSP has 14 as standard –<br>aligned<br>Wording slightly changed  |
|                        |   |   |    |   |   | Populate with the monetary rate that is applicable to the Supply Meter Point for IGT infill charges provided where the Charge Type is B10.  Uplift maximum should not be charged greater than 10/ptherm or 0.3412 per kWh at time of RPC, plus RPI.  Rate demonstrated in pence. | Does the proposed<br>wording clearly<br>articulate what is<br>required?<br>Is the condition<br>clear enough?                       | Changed field name by dropping RPC and made a rate not a charge. ESP suggested wording has been incorporated where appropriate from the ICT file – it referred to I rather than B10 – 'I' is in the portfolio not the invoice template. |
| IGT_INFILL_CHARGE_RATE | С | N | 20 | 4 |   | Populated where the IGT is the Gas Act Owner with a meter charge per pence per day. Rate demonstrated in pence.  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is   | Added un clarification of pence Changed name of the field and made a rate ESP sending wording   |
| METER_OPERATOR_RATE    | С | N | 20 | 4 |   | ·  | required?  | Added un clarification of pence   |

| ı |                           | ı          | 1 | 1 1  | i |  |   |   |
|---|---------------------------|------------|---|------|---|--|---|---|
|   |                           |            |   |      |   |  |   |   |
|   | CONVERTER_RATE            | С          | N | 20   | 4 | Populated where there IGT is the Ga<br>Owner and there is a converter on site ch<br>pence day.<br>Rate demonstrated in pence.  |   | Added un clarification of pence   |
|   | METER MECHANISM           | С          | Т | 2    | 0 | Where the METER_SERIAL_NUMBE populated, populate in accordance wit Retail Gas Metering Arrangements (R A0086 in SPAA Market Domain Data (ME  | the wording clearly MA) articulate what is  | It'll work but quote it RGMA data item value only – remove the listed examples                          |
|   |                           |            |   | _    | - | Populate with the transportation rate for billing/adjustment period. Should exclude RPC uplift cost METER_OPERATOR_RATE CORRECTOR RATE.  | the Does the proposed wording clearly   | rather than pence Since the TWG the proposers have decided to class this as a                           |
| _ | TRANSPORTATION_RATE       | M          | N | 20   | 4 | Rate demonstrated in pence.  Populate where it has entered the RPC re  | gime Does the proposed  | rate Make conditional for RPC   |
|   | RPC_ENTRY_RATE            | С          | N | 20   | 4 | with the transportation rate at time of entry.  Transportation rate before annual adjustr Rate demonstrated in pence.  Where it is legacy leave as null/blank.   | RPC wording clearly articulate what is required?  | Added un clarification of pence   |
|   | TOTAL_CHARGE              | М          | N | 20   | 2 | Populate the total charge exclusive of Voithe period specified between START_DATE and END_DATE.  Charge demonstrated in pounds (£) rathe pence.  | the wording clearly articulate what is  | Clarification that it needs to be £ rather than pence   |
|   | GENERAL INFORMATION       |            | Т | 50   | 0 | Where a Contingency Invoice has generated, the IGT must ensure the GENERAL_INFORMATION field included 1.The term 'Con-Inv' to signify it Contingency Invoice.  2.The invoice number the Contingency Ir relates to.  3.The tax point date the Contingency Ir relates to.  Example: Con-Inv XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | the wording clearly articulate what is required? Contingency invoice wording taken from IGT102. | invoicing in a specified format to<br>keep it within the 50 character<br>length and clarified any other |
|   | 32.12.31E_IIII OIIII/IIII | _ <u> </u> |   | - 55 | 0 |  |   |   |

### Example:

# Z99\_IGT\_INV\_TRAILER

| RECORD/FIELD NAME | ОРТ | DOM | LNG | DEC | DESCRIPTION   | Technical WG<br>Discussion Points   | Technical WG Meeting<br>Recommendations  |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|--|
| TRANSACTION_TYPE  | М   | Т   | 3   | 0   | Populate with a code identifying the type of request that this record represents VALUE: Z99   | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required?  | It will work as drafted  |
| RECORD_COUNT      | М   | N   | 10  | 0   | Populate with the number of detail records contained within the file. This should not include the T01_IGT_INV_HEADER or the T01_IGT_INV_HEADER but should be the count of the B1X*_IGT_CHARGE_TYPE. | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required?  | It will work as drafted  |
| INVOICE_VALUE     | М   | N   | 8   | 2   | Populate with the NET Invoice Amount for the unique Invoice Document  | Does the proposed wording clearly articulate what is required?  The expectation is there will be one backing data item per invoice – does this need to be clearer – see additional note | Removed thousand and the value should be the total for the invoice with a single backing data file |